

United States Patent and Trademark Office

DATE MAILED: 09/25/2002

APPLICATION N	0.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/421,718		10/20/1999	JOSEPH MICHAEL CHRISTIE	1128C	4530
28004	7590	09/25/2002			
SPRINT				EXAMINER	
6391 SPRINT PARKWAY KSOPHT0101-Z2100				YAO, KWANG BIN	
OVERLA	ND PARK,	KS 66251-2100		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				2664	412

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

RECEIVED

OCT - 7 2002

FAEGRE & BENSON LLP

Statuatory Dead



. '	Application No.	Applicant(s)	K
r (09/421,718	CHRISTIE ET AL.	$\boldsymbol{\nu}$
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kwang B. Yao	2664	
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	n appears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence address	1
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR R THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATI - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 C after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communicatic - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory p - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status	ON. FR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reon. a reply within the statutory minimum of thirt period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON statute, cause the application to become AB	eply be timely filed y (30) days will be considered timely. THS from the mailing date of this communication ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	n.
 Responsive to communication(s) filed on 	1 <u>20 October 1999</u> .		
2a)☐ This action is FINAL. 2b)⊠	This action is non-final.	•	
3) Since this application is in condition for a closed in accordance with the practice un Disposition of Claims	allowance except for formal mat nder <i>Ex parte Quayl</i> e, 1935 C.I	ters, prosecution as to the merits 0. 11, 453 O.G. 213.	is
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-42</u> is/are pending in the applic	cation.		
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with	hdrawn from consideration.	·	
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-42</u> is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction a	and/or election requirement.	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Application Papers			
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Exa		– .	
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>20 October 1999</u> is			
Applicant may not request that any objection			
11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _		sapproved by the Examiner.	
If approved, corrected drawings are required			
12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the	ne Examiner.		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120		140() (d) = - (0)	
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fo	oreign priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119(a)-(a) or (t).	
a)□ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:			
1. Certified copies of the priority docur			
2. Certified copies of the priority docur			
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International * See the attached detailed Office action for a section for a sectio	al Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).		
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for dor	mestic priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(e) (to a provisional applicati	ion).
a) The translation of the foreign languag	e provisional application has be mestic priority under 35 U.S.C.	en received. §§ 120 and/or 121.	
Attachment(s)		·	
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No.	8) 5) Notice of I	Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) nformal Patent Application (PTO-152)	

Art Unit: 2664

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 1-42 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-84 of U.S. Patent No. 6,002,689. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the application's claims merely broaden the scope of the patented claims by not claiming some elements (i.e., wherein the interworking unit further is adapted to receive the processed user

Art Unit: 2664

communications and the third control message and to interwork the user communications to the selected second connection to the second communication device, etc.). The application's claims are nearly identical in every other respect to the patent claims. Therefore, the application's claims are simply broader versions of the patented claims. It is the examiner's position that broadening the patented claims by not claiming some of claim elements (i.e., wherein the interworking unit further is adapted to receive the processed user communications and the third control message and to interwork the user communications to the selected second connection to the second communication device, etc.) of the patented claims would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art in view of the patented claims. It is important to note that the instant application is a continuation of the application which yielded the patent (US Pat. 6,002,689) used herein as the basis for the obviousness type of double patenting rejection. The application is attempting to broaden the parent application's claim by eliminating some of the

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

claim elements in the continuation at issue here.

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined

Art Unit: 2664

was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

4. Claims 1-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by White et al. (US 6,069,890).

White et al. discloses a system for providing telephony service comprising the following features: gateway router 104 in Fig. 8 for converting signaling information for a call between a circuit switching signaling format and a packet switching signaling format, for converting communications for the call between PSTN format and IP format, for processing the signaling to select a service for the call; and for providing the selected service for the call.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Ward et al. (US 6,034,972) discloses a distributed local services telecommunication switching system.

Darland et al. (US 5,793,771) discloses a communication gateway.

Everett et al. (US 5,640,446) discloses a system for validating special service calls.

Reiman et al. (US 5,706,286) discloses a telecommunication system.

Art Unit: 2664

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kwang B. Yao whose telephone number is 703-308-7583. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wellington Chin can be reached on 703-305-4366. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9314 for regular communications and 703-872-9314 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

KWANG BIN YAO PRIMARY EXAMINER

Kwang B. // ao September 24, 2002